



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/550,679	11/08/2005	Klaus Geiger	125352	8338
25944 7590 07/08/2008 OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 320850 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850				
EXAMINER				
FAULK, DEVONAE				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2615				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/08/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/550,679

Applicant(s)

GEIGER ET AL.

Examiner

DEVONA E. FAULK

Art Unit

2615

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 March 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 6-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 September 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments, filed 3/28/08, with respect to claims 1-15 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection of claims of 1-15 has been withdrawn.
2. Upon further consideration the examiner has determined that claims 6-15 should be rejected under 112 2nd for indefiniteness due to double inclusion. See MPEP2173.05(o). The examiner contacted the applicant's representative to see if something could be worked out to resolve this matter but the applicant wanted to see an action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 6-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 6,12-15 recite a simulator for use with the method according to one of claim 1 ,2,3,4,5 respectively. Claims 1-5 recite "

by the acoustical volume velocity Q , $Z_t = p/Q$, characterized in that wherein the acoustical volume velocity Q is generated using a simulator(-t0) simulating acoustic properties of at least a head of a human being, the simulator comprising a simulated human ear (44,45) with an orifice in the simulated head and a sound source(-30) in the simulator(-t4) for outputting the acoustical volume velocity Q through the orifice, so as to generate a sound field around the simulator that simulates a sound field around a human being. "

Claims 6,12-15 recite

"simulator(-44)) for use with the method according to claim 1 and simulating acoustic properties of at least a head of a human being, the simulator comprising a simulated human ear (44,45) with an orifice in the simulated head and a sound source(-30) in the

simulator-0-0-) for outputting the acoustical volume velocity Q through the orifice, so as to generate a sound field around the simulator that simulates a sound field around a human being. "

By referencing claims 1-5, in claims 6,12-15 the applicant has essentially claimed certain features twice. This is called double inclusion (See MPEP 2173.05 (o)).

The specification only teaches of one simulator, not two. Therefore, it is not clear to the examiner what reads on the second simulator.

The applicant needs to either rewrite these claims are cancel them.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 1-5 are allowed.

Regarding claim 1, AAPA discloses a method of determining the acoustical transfer impedance $Z_{sub.t}$ between a first position and a listening position of a human being (page 2), the method comprising generating an acoustical volume velocity Q in the listening position (page 2, lines 5-27), measuring a response quantity p at the first position resulting from the volume velocity Q (page 2, lines 5-27), and determining the acoustical transfer impedance $Z_{sub.t}$ as the response quantity p divided by the acoustical volume velocity Q, $Z_{sub.t}=p/Q$ (page 2, lines 5-27), characterized in that the acoustical volume velocity Q is generated using a simulator (implicit) simulating acoustic properties of at least a head of a human being. Prior art Reich, DE 27 16 345 A1, discloses a dummy head in which speakers are disposed in the location of ear imitations.

Prior art Kunugi et al. (US 4,739,513) discloses a simulator (A, Figure 19) including a simulated human ear having a pinnae (dummy mannequin 5-12, Figure 19) and a sound source (11L and 11R, Figure 19; column 11, lines 39-67) in the simulator. The prior art in general teaches of using dummy heads or simulators for measuring and correcting acoustic characteristics in a sound field. .

The prior art or combination thereof fails to disclose or make obvious outputting the acoustical volume velocity Q through the orifice. Orifice is an aperture or hole opening into a bodily cavity.

Therefore, the prior art or combination thereof fails to disclose or make obvious a method of determining the acoustical transfer impedance as claimed.

Claims 2-5 are allowed due to dependency on claim 1.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Devona E. Faulk whose telephone number is 571-272-7515. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 am - 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vivian Chin can be reached on 571-272-7848. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Devona E. Faulk/

Examiner, Art Unit 2615

7/6/08